Strong Converse Theorems for Multimessage Networks with Tight Cut-Set Bound

Silas L. Fong and Vincent Y. F. Tan

arXiv:1606.04678v3 [cs.IT] 9 Jan 2017

Abstract

This paper considers a multimessage network where each node may send a message to any other node in the network. Under the discrete memoryless model, we prove the strong converse theorem for any network with tight cut-set bound, i.e., whose cut-set bound is achievable. Our result implies that for any network with tight cut-set bound and any fixed rate vector that resides outside the capacity region, the average error probabilities of any sequence of length-n codes operated at the rate vector must tend to 1 as n grows. The proof is based on the method of types. The proof techniques are inspired by the work of Csiszár and Körner in 1982 which fully characterized the reliability function of any discrete memoryless channel (DMC) with feedback for rates above capacity. In addition, we generalize the strong converse theorem to the Gaussian model where each node is subject to a peak power constraint. Important consequences of our results are new strong converses for the Gaussian multiple access channel (MAC) with feedback and the following relay channels under both models: The degraded relay channel (RC), the RC with orthogonal sender components, and the general RC with feedback.

Index Terms

Capacity region, cut-set outer bound, method of types, multimessage network, strong converse.

I. Introduction

THIS paper considers a general multimessage network which may consist of multiple nodes. Each node may send a message to any other node in the network. Under the discrete memoryless model where all the input and output alphabets are assumed to be finite, the network is referred to as *discrete memoryless network (DMN)* [1, Ch. 18]. A well-known outer bound on the capacity region of the DMN is the *cut-set bound*, developed by El Gamal in 1981 [2]. This bound states that for any cut-set T of the network with nodes indexed by a set $\mathcal{I}$, the sum of the rates of transmission of messages on one side of the cut is bounded above by the conditional mutual information between the input variables in T and the output variables in $T^c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I} \setminus T$ given the input variables in T^c. The DMN is a generalization of the well-studied discrete memoryless relay channel (DM-RC) [3]. It is known that the cut-set bound is not tight (achievable) in general [4], but it is tight (achievable) for several classes of DMNs, including the degraded DM-RC [3], the degraded DMN [5,6], the semi-deterministic DM-RC [7], the DM-RC with orthogonal sender components [8] and the linear deterministic multicast network [9] among others.

One potential drawback of the cut-set bound is the fact that it is only a *weak converse* for networks with tight cut-set bound. This weak converse only guarantees that for any network with tight cut-set bound and any fixed rate vector residing outside the capacity region, the average probabilities of decoding error of any sequence of length-n codes operated at the rate vector is bounded away from 0 as n tends to infinity. In information theory, it is also important to establish a *strong converse* statement indicating that there is a sharp phase transition of the minimum achievable asymptotic error probability between rate vectors inside and outside the capacity region in the following sense: Any rate vector inside the capacity region can be supported by some sequence of length-n codes with asymptotic error probability being 0, and the asymptotic error probability of any sequence of length-n codes operated at a rate vector outside the capacity region equals 1. A strong converse statement indicates that for any fixed rate vector residing outside the capacity region, the average error probabilities of any sequence of codes operated at the rate vector must necessarily tend to 1. The contrapositive of this statement can roughly be stated as follows: All codes that result in an error probability not exceeding a tolerable error $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ as the block length grows, i.e., ε-reliable codes, must have rate vectors belonging to the capacity region. As a result, the strong converse statement *fully characterizes the fundamental limit of all ε-reliable codes*. Since ε-reliable codes are of fundamental importance to modern short-packet communications for low-latency applications (e.g., online streaming, live data updates, video conferencing and virtual-reality applications), we are motivated to identify the networks to which the strong converse statement can be applied for characterizing the fundamental limit of ε-reliable codes.

S. L. Fong and V. Y. F. Tan are supported by NUS grants R-263-000-A98-750/133, an MOE (Ministry of Education) Tier 2 grant R-263-000-B61-112, and the NUS Young Investigator Award R-263-000-B37-133.

S. L. Fong is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117583 (e-mail: silas_fong@nus.edu.sg).

Vincent Y. F. Tan is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117583, and also with the Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, Singapore 119076 (e-mail: vtan@nus.edu.sg).

A. Related Work

Behboodi and Piantanida first conjectured the strong converses for DM-RCs [10] and DMNs [11] with tight cut-set bound (also see the thesis by Behboodi [12, App. C]). Unfortunately it appears to the present authors that some steps of the proofs, which are based on the information spectrum method [13], are incomplete, as will be elaborated upon in Remark 1 after the first theorem is stated.

In our prior work [14], inspired by the work of Polyanskiy and Verdú [15], we leveraged properties of the conditional Rényi divergence to prove the strong converse for certain classes of DMNs with tight cut-set bound. These include the linear deterministic multicast network [9], the multimessage multicast networks consisting of independent DMCs [16] and the wireless erasure network [17], but excluding the following networks with tight cut-set bound: the degraded DM-RC [3], the degraded DMN [5,6], the semi-deterministic DM-RC [7], and the DM-RC with orthogonal sender components [8]. This work significantly strengthens our prior work by proving the strong converse for all DMNs with tight cut-set bound including the four aforementioned networks left out by our prior work. See Remark 3 for a more detailed discussion.

Our generalization of the strong converse proof for DMNs to Gaussian networks is not obvious, mainly due to the fact that the strong converse proof for DMNs is based on the method of types [18, Ch. 2]. Indeed, the strong converse property does not hold for Gaussian networks with tight cut-set bound in general if long-term power constraints are used instead of peak power constraints, proved by Fong and Tan for the Gaussian degraded RC [19] and Truong et al. for the Gaussian MAC with feedback [20]. Being aware that the existing literature lacks a conclusive statement concerning strong converses for Gaussian networks, we are motivated to provide a strong converse proof for Gaussian networks with tight cut-set bound subject to peak power constraints.

B. Main Contributions

1) First Contribution: The first contribution of this work is a self-contained proof of the strong converse for DMNs with tight cut-set bound. More precisely, our main result shows that for any given DMN, any rate vector that can be supported by a sequence of codes with asymptotic error probability equal to ε must belong to the region prescribed by the cut-set bound as long as $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$. Thus, this result establishes the strong converse for DMNs whose cut-set bounds are known to be tight. So for example, for the degraded DM-RC whose cut-set bound is tight (i.e., all rates below the cut-set bound are achievable in the sense that there exist codes with those rates and vanishing error probabilities), our strong converse result implies that the error probabilities of any sequence of length-n codes operated at a rate above the capacity must necessarily tend to 1 as n grows. The proof is based on the method of types. The proof techniques are inspired by the work of Csiszár and Körner [21] which fully characterized the reliability function of any discrete memoryless channel (DMC) with feedback for rates above capacity (same as that of the corresponding DMC without feedback).

Important consequences of this result are new strong converses for the degraded DM-RC [3], the general RC with feedback [3], the degraded DMN [5,6], the semi-deterministic DM-RC [7], and the DM-RC with orthogonal sender components [8].

2) Second Contribution: The second contribution of this work is the generalization of our strong converse proof to Gaussian networks where the random noises are modeled to be additive white Gaussian and each node is subject to a peak power constraint. This proof for Gaussian networks involves a careful generalization of the method of types for discrete distributions to general distributions. More specifically, the method of types defined for DMNs is based on counting arguments since the input and output alphabets of DMNs are finite. On the contrary, the method of types defined for Gaussian networks is based on careful approximation and quantization arguments due to the continuous input and output alphabets. See Section VI-B for the details regarding the quantization arguments. There is one key difference between the proof for DMNs in Section V and the proof for Gaussian networks in Section VII: In the proof for Gaussian networks, we avoid using conditional types, which cannot be easily defined when the correlation between the input symbols and the noises is not negligible. Instead, we modify our definition of joint type classes in Definition 15 so that we can omit the use of conditional types in our proof. In contrast, the proof for DMNs in Section V relies heavily on the definition of conditional types.

Important consequences of this result are new strong converses for the Gaussian degraded RC [3], the general Gaussian RC with feedback [3], the sender frequency-division Gaussian RC [8], and the Gaussian multiple access channel (MAC) with feedback under peak power constraints [22][1].

C. Paper Outline

This paper is organized as follows. The notations used in this paper are described in the next subsection. Section II presents the problem formulation of the DMN and its ε-capacity region for $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, followed by the first main result in this paper — the strong converse for DMNs with tight cut-set bound. Section III presents the problem formulation of the Gaussian network and its ε-capacity region for $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, followed by the second main result of this paper — the strong converse for Gaussian networks with tight cut-set bound. The preliminaries for the proof of the first result are contained in Section IV, which includes

[1]Although the achievability scheme proposed by Ozarow [22] satisfies only the long-term power constraint, it can be easily modified so that the peak power constraints are satisfied.

well-known results based on the method of types. Section V presents the proof of the first main result. The preliminaries for the proof of the second result are contained in Section VI, which explains the construction and quantization of Gaussian types. Section VII presents the proof of the second main result.

D. Notation

The sets of real and non-negative real numbers are denoted by $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+$ respectively. The N-dimensional identity matrix is denoted by I_N, the length-N all-zero column vector is denoted by $\mathbf{0}_N$, the $N_1 \times N_2$ all-zero matrix is denoted by $0^{N_1 \times N_2}$, and the $N_1 \times N_2$ all-one matrix is denoted by $1^{N_1 \times N_2}$. For any real-valued matrix K, we let K^t denote its transpose. If K is a square matrix, we let $\mathrm{diag}(K)$, $|K|$ and $\mathrm{tr}(K)$ denote the diagonal vector, determinant and trace of K respectively. If K is symmetric, we use $K \succ 0$ and $K \succeq 0$ to represent that K is positive definite and K is positive semi-definite respectively. We let K^{-1} denote the inverse of any invertible matrix K. For any two real-valued matrices A and B of the same dimension, we use $A < B$, $A \leq B$ and $A = B$ to represent the corresponding relations between A and B entrywise. We will take all logarithms to base e throughout this paper.

We use $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}\}$ to represent the probability of an event $\mathcal{E}$, and we let $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{E}\}$ be the characteristic function of $\mathcal{E}$. Every random variable is denoted by a capital letter (e.g., X), and the realization and the alphabet of the random variable are denoted by the corresponding small letter (e.g., x) and calligraphic letter (e.g., $\mathcal{X}$) respectively. We use X^n to denote a random tuple $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$, where the components X_k have the same alphabet $\mathcal{X}$. We let p_X and $p_{Y|X}$ denote the probability distribution of X and the conditional probability distribution of Y given X respectively for any random variables X and Y (can be both discrete, both continuous or one discrete and one continuous). We let $p_X p_{Y|X}$ denote the joint distribution of (X, Y), i.e., $p_X p_{Y|X}(x, y) = p_X(x) p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ for all x and y. For any function f whose domain contains $\mathcal{X}$, we use $\mathrm{E}_{p_X}[f(X)]$ to denote the expectation of $f(X)$ where X is distributed according to p_X. For simplicity, we drop the subscript of a notation if there is no ambiguity. For any discrete random variable (U, X, Y, Z) distributed according to $p_{U,X,Y,Z}$, we let $H_{p_{U,X,Y,Z}}(X|Z)$ or more simply $H_{p_{X,Z}}(X|Z)$ denote the entropy of X given Z, and let $I_{p_{U,X,Y,Z}}(X;Y|Z)$ or more simply $I_{p_{X,Y,Z}}(X;Y|Z)$ denote the mutual information between X and Y given Z. The relative entropy between $p_{Y|X}$ and $q_{Y|X}$ given r_X is denoted by $D(p_{Y|X}\|q_{Y|X}|r_X)$. The $\mathcal{L}_1$-distance between two distributions p_X and q_X on the same discrete alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, denoted by $\|p_X - q_X\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}$, is defined as $\|p_X - q_X\|_{\mathcal{L}_1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |p_X(x) - q_X(x)|$. For any N-dimensional real-valued Gaussian vector $\boldsymbol{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [Z_1\ Z_2\ \ldots Z_N]^t$ whose mean and covariance are $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ respectively, we let

$$\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{z}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^N |\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu})^t \Sigma^{-1} (\boldsymbol{z}-\boldsymbol{\mu})} \tag{1}$$

be the corresponding probability density function.

II. Discrete Memoryless Network and the First Main Result

We consider a general network that consists of N nodes. Let

$$\mathcal{I} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$$

be the index set of the nodes. The N terminals exchange information in n time slots as follows. Node i chooses message $W_{i,j}$ according to the uniform distribution from the alphabet

$$\mathcal{W}_{i,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, 2, \ldots, \lceil e^{nR_{i,j}} \rceil\} \tag{2}$$

and sends $W_{i,j}$ to node j for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$, where $R_{i,j}$ characterizes the rate of message $W_{i,j}$ and all the messages are mutually independent. For each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, node i transmits $X_{i,k} \in \mathcal{X}_i$, a function of $\{W_{i,\ell} | \ell \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and Y_i^{k-1}, and receives $Y_{i,k} \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ in the k^{th} time slot where $\mathcal{X}_i$ and $\mathcal{Y}_i$ are some alphabets that possibly depend on i. After n time slots, node j declares $\hat{W}_{i,j}$ to be the transmitted $W_{i,j}$ based on $\{W_{j,\ell} : \ell \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and Y_j^n for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$.

To simplify notation, we use the following conventions for each $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$: For any random vector

$$[X_1\ X_2\ \ldots\ X_N]^t \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_N, \tag{3}$$

we let

$$X_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [X_i : i \in T]^t \tag{4}$$

be the subvector of $[X_1\ X_2\ \ldots\ X_N]^t$ and $\mathcal{X}_T$ be the alphabet of X_T. Similarly, for any $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and any random vector

$$[X_{1,k}\ X_{2,k}\ \ldots\ X_{N,k}]^t \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_N, \tag{5}$$

we let

$$X_{T,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [X_{i,k} : i \in T]^t \tag{6}$$

be the subvector of $[X_{1,k}, X_{2,k}, \ldots, X_{N,k}]^t$. For any $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and any N^2-dimensional random vector

$$[W_{1,1}\ W_{1,2}\ \ldots\ W_{N,N}]^t \in \mathcal{W}_{1,1} \times \mathcal{W}_{1,2} \times \ldots \times \mathcal{W}_{N,N},$$

we let

$$W_{T_1 \times T_2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [W_{i,j} : (i,j) \in T_1 \times T_2] \tag{7}$$

be the subtuple of $[W_{1,1}\ W_{1,2}\ \ldots\ W_{N,N}]^t$. The following six definitions formally define a DMN and its capacity region.

Definition 1: A discrete network consists of N finite input sets $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_N$, N finite output sets $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{Y}_N$ and a transition matrix $q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}$. The discrete network is denoted by $(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}})$. For every $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the marginal distribution $q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}$ is defined as

$$q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{T^c}|x_{\mathcal{I}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{y_T \in \mathcal{Y}_T} q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{\mathcal{I}}|x_{\mathcal{I}})$$

for all $x_{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}$ and all $y_{T^c} \in \mathcal{Y}_{T^c}$.

Definition 2: Let $(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}})$ be a discrete network. An $(n, \boldsymbol{R})$-code, where $\boldsymbol{R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [R_{1,1}\ R_{1,2}\ \ldots\ R_{N,N}]^t \geq \mathbf{0}_{N^2}$ denotes the N^2-dimensional rate vector, for n uses of the network consists of the following:

1) A message set $\mathcal{W}_{i,j}$ at node i for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}$ as defined in (2). Message $W_{i,j}$ is uniform on $\mathcal{W}_{i,j}$.
2) An encoding function

$$f_{i,k} : \mathcal{W}_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}} \times \mathcal{Y}_i^{k-1} \to \mathcal{X}_i$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, where $f_{i,k}$ is the encoding function at node i in the k^{th} time slot such that[2]

$$X_{i,k} = f_{i,k}(W_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, Y_i^{k-1}).$$

3) A decoding function

$$\varphi_i : \mathcal{W}_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}} \times \mathcal{Y}_i^{n} \to \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, where φ_i is the decoding function for $W_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}$ at node i such that

$$\hat{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}} = \varphi_i(W_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, Y_i^{n}).$$

Definition 3: A discrete network $(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}})$, when used multiple times, is called a *discrete memoryless network (DMN)* if the following holds for any $(n, \boldsymbol{R})$-code:

Let $U^{k-1} = (W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, X_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})$ be the collection of random variables that are generated before the k^{th} time slot. Then, for each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and each $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,

$$\Pr\{U^{k-1} = u^{k-1}, X_{\mathcal{I},k} = x_{\mathcal{I},k}, Y_{T^c,k} = y_{T^c,k}\} = \Pr\{U^{k-1} = u^{k-1}, X_{\mathcal{I},k} = x_{\mathcal{I},k}\} q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{T^c,k}|x_{\mathcal{I},k})$$

holds for all $u^{k-1} \in \mathcal{U}^{k-1}$, $x_{\mathcal{I},k} \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $y_{T^c,k} \in \mathcal{Y}_{T^c}$.

Definition 4: For an $(n, \boldsymbol{R})$-code, we can calculate the average probability of decoding error defined as

$$\Pr\left\{\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(W_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, Y_i^n) \neq W_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\}\right\}.$$

We call an $(n, \boldsymbol{R})$-code with average probability of decoding error no larger than ε_n an $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \varepsilon_n)$-code.

Definition 5: A rate vector $\boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2}$ is *ε-achievable* if there exists a sequence of $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \varepsilon_n)$-codes such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $R_{i,i} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ in the rest of this paper.

Definition 6: The *ε-capacity region*, denoted by $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$, of the DMN is the closure of the set consisting of every ε-achievable rate vector $\boldsymbol{R}$ with $R_{i,i} = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. The *capacity region* is defined to be 0-capacity region $\mathcal{C}_0$.

The following theorem is the first main result in this paper.

Theorem 1: Let $(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}})$ be a DMN. Define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}} \bigcap_{T\subseteq\mathcal{I}} \left\{ \boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \sum\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c} R_{i,j} \leq I_{p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_T; Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c}), \\ R_{i,i} = 0 \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I} \end{array} \right\}. \tag{8}$$

Then for each $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$,

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}. \tag{9}$$

[2]We assume by convention that the domain of $f_{i,1}$ is $\mathcal{W}_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}} \times \emptyset$.

Remark 1: The authors in [11,12] conjectured that the strong converse holds for general DMNs with tight cut-set bound and they employed information spectrum techniques. However, the fourth equality of the chain of equalities after equation (C.8) in [12] need not hold, which implies that the first step of their proof in [11, Section IV.B] is incomplete. Consequently, their proof has a gap. Our proof of Theorem 1 does not use information spectrum methods. Rather, we use the method of types to establish a strong converse for DMNs with tight cut-set bound.

Remark 2: We observe from Theorem 1 that the cut-set bound characterized by (9) is a universal outer bound on $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ for all $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$, which implies the strong converse for the class of DMNs whose cut-set bounds are achievable. As mentioned in Section I-B1, the class includes the degraded DM-RC [3], the general RC with feedback [3], the degraded DMN [5,6], the semi-deterministic DM-RC [7], and the DM-RC with orthogonal sender components [8].

Remark 3: Theorem 1 establishes the strong converse for any DMN with tight cut-set bound under the *multiple unicast demand* where each node has a unique message to send to each other node. By slightly changing the definition of *multiple unicast* codes to *multimessage multicast* codes and modifying the definition of ε-achievable rates, we can follow almost the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 1 and derive the strong converse for DMNs with tight cut-set bound under the *multimessage multicast demand* where each source node sends a single message and each destination node wants to recover all the source messages. This strong converse result under the multimessage multicast demand strengthens our prior strong converse result [14] established for some classes of multicast networks with tight cut-set bound. To be more explicit, our prior strong converse result specialized to the multiple unicast demand scenario states that

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{out}} \tag{10}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$, where

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{out}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{T \subseteq \mathcal{I}} \bigcup_{p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}} \left\{ \boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \sum\limits_{(i,j) \in T \times T^c} R_{i,j} \leq I_{p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_T; Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c}), \\ R_{i,i} = 0 \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I} \end{array} \right\}. \tag{11}$$

Comparing (8) to (11), we observe that the union and intersection are swapped and consequently, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{out}}$ with strict inequality for many classes of networks. Thus, Theorem 1 is considerably stronger than the main theorem in [14]. In particular, Theorem 1 establishes the strong converse for the following four networks: the physically degraded DM-RC, the physically degraded DMN, the semi-deterministic DM-RC, and the DM-RC with orthogonal sender components. Strong converses for these important networks were not proved in our previous paper [14]. The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the method of types [18], which is completely different compared to the Rényi divergence approach in our prior work [14]. It seems challenging (to the authors) to use other standard strong converse proof techniques to prove Theorem 1 such as the Rényi divergence approach [14,15], the information spectrum method [13] and the blowing-up lemma [18, Ch. 5] [23].

Remark 4: The proof of Theorem 1 implies that for any fixed rate vector $\boldsymbol{R}$ lying outside the cut-set bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$, the average probabilities of correct decoding of any sequence of $(n, \boldsymbol{R})$-codes tend to 0 exponentially fast. See (84) in the proof for the derived upper bound on the non-asymptotic probability of correct decoding. In other words, we have proved an *exponential strong converse* for networks with tight cut-set bound (cf. Oohama's works in [24] and [25] that established exponential strong converse for broadcast channels). We leave the exact characterization of the strong converse exponent to future work.

Remark 5: The proof of Theorem 1 is inspired by two works which are based on the method of types [18]. First, Tan showed in [26] that the proof techniques used for analyzing the reliability functions of DMCs with feedback can be applied to DM-RCs. Second, Csiszár and Körner [21] fully characterized the reliability functions of any DMC with feedback for rates above capacity. We use those ideas in the proof of Theorem 1.

Example 1: Consider a 3-node DM-RC where the source is indexed by 1, the relay is indexed by 2 and the destination is indexed by 3. The capacity of the DM-RC is unknown in general. However, if there exists a noiseless feedback link which carries Y_3^{k-1} to node 2 in each time slot k, then the capacity of the resultant DM-RC with feedback coincides with the cut-set bound [1, Sec. 17.4], which is intuitively true because the feedback link transforms the DM-RC into a physically degraded DM-RC. Consequently, Theorem 1 implies that the DM-RC with feedback to the relay satisfies the strong converse property. In addition, inserting two noiseless feedback links which carry Y_2^{k-1} and Y_3^{k-1} to node 1 in each time slot k does not further increase the capacity of the DM-RC with feedback, and hence the strong converse property also holds under this setting.

III. Gaussian Network and the Second Main Result

In this section, we consider the Gaussian network whose channel law is described below. For each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, node i transmits $X_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}$, a function of $\{W_{i,\ell} : \ell \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and Y_i^{k-1}, and receives

$$Y_{i,k} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_{ij} X_{j,k} + Z_{i,k} \tag{12}$$

in the k^{th} time slot, where $g_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ characterizes the constant channel gain associated with the signal path starting from node j and ending at node i and $Z_{i,k}$ denotes the additive Gaussian noise experienced by node i. Each node $i \in \mathcal{I}$ is subject to the peak power constraint

$$\Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{i,k}^2 \le P_i\right\} = 1 \tag{13}$$

where $P_i > 0$ is some constant specifying the admissible power for node i. To facilitate discussion, we define $X_{\mathcal{I},k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [X_{1,k}\ X_{2,k}\ \ldots\ X_{N,k}]^t$ and $Y_{\mathcal{I},k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [Y_{1,k}\ Y_{2,k}\ \ldots\ Y_{N,k}]^t$, and let $G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [g_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ be the $N \times N$ channel gain matrix that does not depend on k. In addition, let $Z_{\mathcal{I},k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [Z_{1,k}\ Z_{2,k}\ \ldots\ Z_{N,k}]^t$ be a zero-mean Gaussian vector with some covariance matrix $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succ 0$ where $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ characterizes the correlation among the N Gaussian noises. The relation between $X_{\mathcal{I},k}$ and $Y_{\mathcal{I},k}$ can be written as follows for each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$:

$$Y_{\mathcal{I},k} = G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} X_{\mathcal{I},k} + Z_{\mathcal{I},k}. \tag{14}$$

After n time slots, node j declares $\hat{W}_{i,j}$ to be the transmitted $W_{i,j}$ based on $\{W_{j,\ell} : \ell \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and Y_j^n for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$.

To simplify notation, we use the following convention for any $T_1, T_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}$: For any $N \times N$ matrix

$$G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [g_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, \tag{15}$$

we let

$$G_{T_1\times T_2} = [g_{ij}]_{(i,j)\in T_1\times T_2} \tag{16}$$

denote the submatrix of $G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$.

Definition 7: An $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code, where $\boldsymbol{P} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [P_1\ P_2\ \ldots\ P_N]^t > \mathbf{0}_N$ denotes the N-dimensional vector that specifies the admissible power, for the Gaussian network is an $(n, \boldsymbol{R})$-code defined in Definition 2 with the following extra assumptions: $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and the power constraint (13) is satisfied for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Definition 8: A Gaussian network, denoted by $(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$, is characterized by a channel gain matrix $G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$, an $N \times N$ real-valued covariance matrix $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succ 0$, and a transition matrix $q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}$ where

$$q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{\mathcal{I}}|x_{\mathcal{I}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{N}(y_{\mathcal{I}}; G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} x_{\mathcal{I}}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}) \tag{17}$$

such that the following holds for any $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code:

Let $U^{k-1} = (W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, X_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})$ be the collection of random variables that are generated before the k^{th} time slot. Then, for each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and each $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$,

$$p_{U^{k-1},X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(u^{k-1}, x_{\mathcal{I},k}, y_{T^c,k}) = p_{U^{k-1},X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(u^{k-1}, x_{\mathcal{I},k}) q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{T^c,k}|x_{\mathcal{I},k}) \tag{18}$$

holds for all u^{k-1}, $x_{\mathcal{I},k}$ and $y_{T^c,k}$, where $q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}$ is the marginal distribution of $q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}$ defined as

$$q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{T^c}|x_{\mathcal{I}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|T|}} q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{\mathcal{I}}|x_{\mathcal{I}}) \mathrm{d}y_T \tag{19}$$

for all $x_{\mathcal{I}}$ and all y_{T^c}.

The average probability of decoding error for an $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code is defined in a similar way to Definition 4, and $\boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2}$ is said to be ε-*achievable* if there exists a sequence of $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_n)$-codes such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n \le \varepsilon$. The ε-*capacity region*, denoted by $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$, of the Gaussian network is the closure of the set consisting of every ε-achievable rate vector. The *capacity region* is defined to be the 0-capacity region $\mathcal{C}_0$. The following theorem is the second main result of this paper.

Theorem 2: Let $(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$ be a Gaussian network. For each covariance matrix $K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ and each $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, let $K_{T|T^c}$ denote the conditional covariance of X_T given X_{T^c} when $X_{\mathcal{I}} \sim \mathcal{N}(x_{\mathcal{I}}; \mathbf{0}_N, K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$, i.e.,

$$K_{T|T^c} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{E}\left[\mathrm{E}\left[(X_T - \mathrm{E}[X_T|X_{T^c}])(X_T - \mathrm{E}[X_T|X_{T^c}])^t \,|X_{T^c}\right]\right]. \tag{20}$$

Define

$$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N} \,\middle|\, K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succeq 0 \text{ where the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ diagonal element } k_{ii} \text{ satisfies } k_{ii} \le P_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I}\right\} \tag{21}$$

to be the set of covariance matrices that characterize the correlation among the transmitted symbols. Define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})} \bigcap_{T\subseteq\mathcal{I}} \left\{\boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^2} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \sum_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c} R_{i,j} \le \frac{1}{2}\log\left|I_{|T^c|} + G_{T^c\times T} K_{T|T^c} G_{T^c\times T}^t \left(\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}\right)^{-1}\right|, \\ R_{i,i} = 0 \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I} \end{array}\right\}. \tag{22}$$

Then for each $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$,

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}. \tag{23}$$

Remark 6: We observe from Theorem 2 that the cut-set bound characterized by (23) is a universal outer bound on $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ for all $0 \le \varepsilon < 1$, which implies the strong converse for the class of Gaussian networks whose cut-set bounds are achievable. Gaussian degraded RC [3], the general Gaussian RC with feedback [3], the sender frequency-division Gaussian RC [8], and the Gaussian MAC with feedback under peak power constraints [22]

Remark 7: The proof of Theorem 2 implies that for any fixed rate vector $\boldsymbol{R}$ lying outside the cut-set bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$, the average probabilities of correct decoding of any sequence of $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-codes tend to 0 exponentially fast. See (180) in the proof for the derived upper bound on the non-asymptotic probability of correct decoding. In other words, we have proved an *exponential strong converse* for Gaussian networks with tight cut-set bound (cf. Oohama's works in [24] and [25] that established exponential strong converse for broadcast channels). We leave the exact characterization of the strong converse exponent to future work.

Example 2: Consider a 3-node Gaussian RC where the source is indexed by 1, the relay is indexed by 2 and the destination is indexed by 3. Suppose nodes 1 and 2 are subject to the peak power constraints (13). The capacity of this Gaussian RC is unknown in general. However, if there exists a noiseless feedback link which carries Y_3^{k-1} to node 2 in each time slot k, then the capacity of the resultant Gaussian RC with feedback coincides with the cut-set bound [1, Sec. 17.4], which is intuitively true because the feedback link transforms the Gaussian RC into a Gaussian degraded RC. Consequently, Theorem 2 implies that the Gaussian RC with feedback to the relay satisfies the strong converse property. In addition, inserting two noiseless feedback links which carry Y_2^{k-1} and Y_3^{k-1} to node 1 in each time slot k does not further increase the capacity of the DM-RC with feedback, and hence the strong converse property also holds under this setting. However, if the peak power constraints (13) are replaced with the long-term power constraints

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{i,k}^2\right] \le P_i, \tag{24}$$

the Gaussian RC no longer satisfies the strong converse property [19].

Example 3: Consider a 2-source Gaussian MAC with feedback where the two sources are indexed by 1 and 2 respectively. Suppose nodes 1 and 2 are subject to the peak power constraints (13). In addition, there exists a noiseless feedback link which carries Y^{k-1} to both nodes 1 and 2 in each time slot k. Although the achievability scheme that achieves the cut-set bound proposed by Ozarow [22] satisfies only the long-term power constraint in (24), it can be easily modified so that the peak power constraints (13) are satisfied. Therefore, the capacity of this Gaussian MAC with feedback coincides with the cut-set bound. Consequently, Theorem 2 implies that the Gaussian MAC with feedback satisfies the strong converse property. However, if the peak power constraints (13) are replaced with the long-term power constraints (24), the Gaussian RC no longer satisfies the strong converse property [20].

IV. Preliminaries for Proving Theorem 1 — The Method of Types

The following definitions and results are standard [18, Ch. 2]. The *type* of a sequence $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$, denoted by $\phi_X^{[x^n]}$, is the empirical distribution of x^n, i.e.,

$$\phi_X^{[x^n]}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{N(a|x^n)}{n} \tag{25}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$ where $N(a|x^n)$ denotes the number of occurrences of the symbol a in x^n. The set of all possible types of sequences in $\mathcal{X}^n$ is denoted by

$$\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \phi_X^{[x^n]} \,\middle|\, x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \right\}. \tag{26}$$

Similarly, the set of all possible types of sequences in $\mathcal{Y}^n$ conditioned on a type $r_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ is denoted by

$$\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}|r_X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ s_{Y|X} \,\middle|\, \text{There exists an } (x^n, y^n) \text{ such that } \phi_X^{[x^n]} = r_X \text{ and } \phi_{X,Y}^{[(x^n,y^n)]} = r_X s_{Y|X} \right\}. \tag{27}$$

For a given type $r_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, the *type class* of r_X is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{r_X}^{(n)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \,\middle|\, \phi_X^{[x^n]} = r_X \right\}. \tag{28}$$

A well-known upper bound on the number of types is

$$|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})| \le (n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}. \tag{29}$$

We will frequently use the following fact without explicit explanation: For each $r_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, each $s_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}|r_X)$ and each transition matrix $q_{Y|X}$, the following equality holds for any $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}_{r_X s_{Y|X}}$:

$$\prod_{k=1}^{n} q_{Y|X}(y_k|x_k) = \prod_{x,y} q_{Y|X}(y|x)^{n r_X(x) s_{Y|X}(y|x)} \tag{30}$$

$$= e^{-n(H_{r_X s_{Y|X}}(Y|X) + D(s_{Y|X}\|q_{Y|X}|r_X))}. \tag{31}$$

V. Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we will show that for all $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}} \tag{32}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ is as defined in (8). It suffices to show that for any $\boldsymbol{R} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ and any sequence of $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \varepsilon_n)$-codes,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n = 1. \tag{33}$$

To this end, we fix a rate vector $\boldsymbol{R} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ and a sequence of $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \varepsilon_n)$-codes.

A. Relating $\boldsymbol{R}$ to the Cut-Set Bound

Since $\boldsymbol{R} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ is closed, we can always find a positive number denoted by $\delta > 0$ such that for any distribution $r_{X_\mathcal{I}}$ defined on $\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{I}$, there exists a $V_{r_{X_\mathcal{I}}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ that satisfies

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in V_r \times V_r^c} R_{i,j} \geq I_{r_{X_\mathcal{I}} q_{Y_{V_r^c}|X_\mathcal{I}}}(X_{V_r}; Y_{V_r^c}|X_{V_r^c}) + \delta, \tag{34}$$

where the shorthand notation V_r is used to denote $V_{r_{X_\mathcal{I}}}$.

B. Simplifying the Correct Decoding Probability by Using the Discrete Memoryless Property

Fix a natural number n and let $p_{W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, X^n_\mathcal{I}, Y^n_\mathcal{I}, \hat{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}$ be the probability distribution induced by the $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \varepsilon_n)$-code. Unless specified otherwise, the probabilities are evaluated according to $p_{W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, X^n_\mathcal{I}, Y^n_\mathcal{I}, \hat{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}$ in the rest of the proof. Consider the probability of correct decoding

$$1 - \varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|} \sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \Pr\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left\{\varphi_i\left(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, Y_i^n\right) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\} \middle| W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \right\}. \tag{35}$$

In order to simplify the RHS of (35), we write for each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$

$$\Pr\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, Y_i^n) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\} \middle| W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \right\}$$

$$= \sum_{y^n_\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{Y}^n_\mathcal{I}} p_{Y^n_\mathcal{I}|W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}(y^n_\mathcal{I}) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\} \right\} \tag{36}$$

$$= \sum_{y^n_\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{Y}^n_\mathcal{I}} \prod_{k=1}^{n} p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|Y^{k-1}_\mathcal{I}, W_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}=w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|y^{k-1}_\mathcal{I}) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\} \right\} \tag{37}$$

$$\overset{\text{(a)}}{=} \sum_{y^n_\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{Y}^n_\mathcal{I}} \prod_{k=1}^{n} p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I})) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\} \right\}, \tag{38}$$

where (a) follows from Definitions 2 and 3.

C. Further Simplifying the Correct Decoding Probability by Using the Method of Types

With a slight abuse of notation, we let

$$f_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (f_{i,1}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^0), f_{i,2}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^1), \ldots, f_{i,n}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{n-1})) \tag{39}$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. For each $w_{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}}$, each type $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ and each conditional type $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$, we define

$$\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}; r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}, s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n \,\middle|\, ((f_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) : i \in \mathcal{I}), y_{\mathcal{I}}^n) \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}} \right\} \tag{40}$$

and define for each $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and each $w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}$

$$\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}; r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}, s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ y_{T^c}^n \in \mathcal{Y}_{T^c}^n \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} ((f_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) : i \in T^c), y_{T^c}^n) \in \mathcal{T}^{(n)}_{u_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}}} \\ \text{where } u_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}} \text{ is the marginal type} \\ \text{of } r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \text{ restricted to } (X_{T^c}, Y_{T^c}) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{41}$$

Note that the set $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}; r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}, s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}})$ in (40) also plays a crucial role in the proof of the upper bound on the reliability functions for DM-RCs in [26]. Following (38) and adopting the shorthand notation $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}; r, s)$ to denote the set in (40), since the collection of sets $\{\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}; r, s) | \, r \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}), s \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})\}$ forms a partition on $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ for each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$, the probability of correct decoding conditioned on $\{W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\}$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I})) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})} \sum_{s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})} \sum_{\substack{y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}; r, s)}} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I})) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^n) = w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

D. Bounding the Correct Decoding Probability in Terms of $\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}; r, s)$

Fix any arbitrary $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Define

$$a_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}) + D(s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \| q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} | r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}) \tag{43}$$

to simplify notation. In order to simplify the RHS of (42), we consider the innermost product. In particular, we consider the following chain of equalities for each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$, each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$, each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$, and each $y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}; r, s)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I})) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T^c,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{T^c,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I})) p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I}), y_{T^c,k}) &(44)\\ &\stackrel{\text{(b)}}{=} \left(\prod_{x_{\mathcal{I}}, y_{T^c}} q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{T^c}|x_{\mathcal{I}})^{nr(x_{\mathcal{I}})s(y_{T^c}|x_{\mathcal{I}})} \right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I}), y_{T^c,k}) \right) &(45)\\ &\stackrel{(43)}{=} e^{-na_T} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_i^{k-1}) : i \in \mathcal{I}), y_{T^c,k}) &(46) \end{aligned}$$

where (b) follows from Definition 3 and the fact that $y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ (recall the definition of $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ in (40)). Following (42) and letting $\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ denote the set in (41), we consider the following chain of inequalities for each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ and each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$:

$$\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{\substack{y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\}$$

$$\overset{(46)}{=} e^{-na_T} \sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{\substack{y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}),y_{T^c,k})$$
$$\times\,\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\} \tag{47}$$

$$\overset{(c)}{\le} e^{-na_T} \sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{y_{T^c}^n\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} \sum_{y_T\in\mathcal{Y}_T} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}),y_{T^c,k})$$
$$\times\,\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\} \tag{48}$$

$$= e^{-na_T} \sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{y_{T^c}^n\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} \mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\} \tag{49}$$

$$= e^{-na_T} \sum_{w_{(T\times T^c)^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}} \sum_{y_{T^c}^n\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} \sum_{w_{T\times T^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{T\times T^c}} \mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\} \tag{50}$$

$$\overset{(d)}{\le} e^{-na_T} \sum_{w_{(T\times T^c)^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}} \sum_{y_{T^c}^n\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} 1 \tag{51}$$

$$= e^{-na_T} \sum_{w_{(T\times T^c)^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}} |\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)|, \tag{52}$$

where

(c) follows from the definitions of $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ and $\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ in (40) and (41) respectively.

(d) follows from the fact that for each $w_{(T\times T^c)^c} \in \mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}$ and each $y_{T^c}^n \in \mathcal{Y}_{T^c}^n$,

$$\sum_{w_{T\times T^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{T\times T^c}} \mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\}$$
$$\le \sum_{w^*_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}} \mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w^*_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\} \tag{53}$$
$$= 1 \tag{54}$$

(the last equality is a consequence of the simple fact that φ_i is a function that outputs values in $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$).

E. Bounding the Size of $\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$

For each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ and each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$, we let $u_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}}$ denote the marginal type induced by $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}$ in order to obtain an upper bound on $|\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)|$ as follows. For each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$, each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$ and each $w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}$, since

$$\sum_{y_{T^c}^n\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} \prod_{k=1}^n u_{Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c}}(y_{T^c,k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in T^c)) \le 1, \tag{55}$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{y_{T^c}^n\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} \prod_{x_{T^c},y_{T^c}} u_{Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c}}(y_{T^c}|x_{T^c})^{nu_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}}(x_{T^c},y_{T^c})} \le 1 \tag{56}$$

(recall the definition of $\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ in (41)), which implies that

$$\sum_{y^n_{T^c}\in\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)} e^{-nH_{u_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}}}(Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})}\le 1, \tag{57}$$

which then implies that

$$|\mathcal{F}_T(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)|\le e^{nH_{u_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}}}(Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})}. \tag{58}$$

Combining (52), (43) and (58) and using the fact due to (43) that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}|}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}=\frac{1}{\prod\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}\lceil e^{nR_{i,j}}\rceil}\le e^{-n\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}R_{i,j}}, \tag{59}$$

we have for each $r_{X_\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{I})$ and each $s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{I}|r_{X_\mathcal{I}})$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\sum_{\substack{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}}\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\}\right\}\\ &\le e^{-n\left(\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}R_{i,j}-I_{r_{X_\mathcal{I}}s_{Y_{T^c}|X_\mathcal{I}}}(X_T;Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})+D(s_{Y_{T^c}|X_\mathcal{I}}\|q_{Y_{T^c}|X_\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_\mathcal{I}})\right)}.\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Note that (60) resembles [21, Eq. (5)] in the proof of the reliability functions for DMCs with feedback.

F. Bounding the Correct Decoding Probability in Terms of $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$

We now bound the LHS of (60) in another way for each $r_{X_\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{I})$ and each $s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{I}|r_{X_\mathcal{I}})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\sum_{\substack{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}}\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\}\right\}\\ &\le\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\sum_{\substack{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}}\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\overset{\text{(e)}}{=}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\sum_{\substack{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}}\prod_{x_\mathcal{I},y_\mathcal{I}}q_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}(y_\mathcal{I}|x_\mathcal{I})^{nr(x_\mathcal{I})s(y_\mathcal{I}|x_\mathcal{I})}\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

$$=\frac{e^{-n(H_{r_\mathcal{I}s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}}(Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I})+D(s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}\|q_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_\mathcal{I}}))}}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}|\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)|, \tag{63}$$

where (e) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ in (40) and Definition 3.

G. Bounding the Size of $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$

For each $r_{X_\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{I})$, each $s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{I}|r_{X_\mathcal{I}})$ and each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$, since

$$\sum_{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}\prod_{k=1}^n s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\le 1, \tag{64}$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}\prod_{x_\mathcal{I},y_\mathcal{I}}s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}(y_\mathcal{I}|x_\mathcal{I})^{nr(x_\mathcal{I})s(y_\mathcal{I}|x_\mathcal{I})}\le 1 \tag{65}$$

(recall the definition of $\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)$ in (40)), which implies that

$$\sum_{y^n_\mathcal{I}\in\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}e^{-nH_{r_{X_\mathcal{I}}s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}}(Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I})}\le 1, \tag{66}$$

which then implies that

$$|\mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)|\le e^{nH_{r_{X_\mathcal{I}}s_{Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I}}}(Y_\mathcal{I}|X_\mathcal{I})}. \tag{67}$$

Combining (63) and (67), we have for each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ and each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\sum_{\substack{y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}}\prod_{k=1}^{n}p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\}$$
$$\le e^{-nD(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})}. \tag{68}$$

H. Relating the Bounds on Correct Decoding Probability to the Cut-Set Bound

Defining

$$\alpha_T(r,s)\overset{\text{def}}{=}e^{-n\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}R_{i,j}-I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_T;Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})+D(s_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})\right)} \tag{69}$$

and

$$\beta(r,s)\overset{\text{def}}{=}e^{-nD(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})}, \tag{70}$$

we obtain from (60) and (68) that for each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ and each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$,

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\sum_{\substack{y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\in\\ \mathcal{A}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};r,s)}}\prod_{k=1}^{n}p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|(f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in\mathcal{I}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\}$$
$$\le \min\{\alpha_T(r,s),\beta(r,s)\}. \tag{71}$$

Combining (35), (38) and (42) and using the fact that (71) holds for each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$, each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$ and any arbitrary $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, we conclude that

$$1-\varepsilon_n \le \sum_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})}\sum_{s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})}\min\{\alpha_{V_r}(r,s),\beta(r,s)\} \tag{72}$$

where the set $V_r \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ was carefully chosen to depend on $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ so that (34) holds. Note that (72) resembles [21, Eq. (7)]. Let $\xi > 0$ be a positive constant to be specified later. It then follows from (72) that

$$\begin{aligned}1-\varepsilon_n \le &\sum_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})}\sum_{s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\in\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})}\min\{\alpha_{V_r}(r,s),\beta(r,s)\}\\ &\times\left(\mathbf{1}\left\{D(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})\ge\xi\right\}+\mathbf{1}\left\{D(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})<\xi\right\}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

I. Bounding the Correct Decoding Probability in Two Different Ways

Recalling that $\delta > 0$ was chosen such that (34) holds, we choose $\xi > 0$ to be a positive constant such that the following statement holds for all $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$:

$$|I_{g_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_T;Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})-I_{h_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_T;Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})|\le\delta/2 \tag{74}$$

for all distributions $g_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}$ and $h_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}$ defined on $(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}},\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}})$ that satisfy

$$\|g_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}-h_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}\le\sqrt{2\xi/\log e}. \tag{75}$$

The existence of such a $\xi > 0$ is guaranteed by the fact that the mapping $p_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}} \mapsto I_{p_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_T;Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c})$ is continuous with respect to the $\mathcal{L}_1$-distance for all $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Following (73), we consider the following two chains of inequalities for each $r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}})$ and each $s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\min\{\alpha_{V_r}(r,s),\beta(r,s)\}\times\mathbf{1}\left\{D(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})\ge\xi\right\}\\ &\le\beta(r,s)\times\mathbf{1}\left\{D(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})\ge\xi\right\} &(76)\\ &\overset{(70)}{\le}e^{-n\xi} &(77)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min\{\alpha_{V_r}(r,s),\beta(r,s)\}\times\mathbf{1}\left\{D(s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}})<\xi\right\}\\
&\overset{\text{(f)}}{\le}\alpha_{V_r}(r,s)\times\mathbf{1}\left\{\|r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}-r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_1}<\sqrt{2\xi/\log e}\right\} &(78)\\
&\overset{(74)}{\le}\alpha_{V_r}(r,s)\times\mathbf{1}\left\{|I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_{V_r};Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{V_r{}^c})-I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_{V_r};Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{V_r{}^c})|\le\delta/2\right\} &(79)\\
&\overset{(69)}{\le}e^{-n\left(\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in V_r\times V_r{}^c}R_{i,j}-I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}s_{Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_{V_r};Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{V_r{}^c})\right)}\\
&\qquad\times\mathbf{1}\left\{|I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}s_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_{V_r};Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{V_r{}^c})-I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}q_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_{V_r};Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{V_r{}^c})|\le\delta/2\right\} &(80)\\
&\le e^{-n\left(\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in V_r\times V_r{}^c}R_{i,j}-I_{r_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}q_{Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}}(X_{V_r};Y_{V_r{}^c}|X_{V_r{}^c})-\delta/2\right)} &(81)\\
&\overset{(34)}{\le}e^{-n\delta/2}, &(82)
\end{aligned}$$

where (f) follows from Pinsker's inequality. Combining (73), (77) and (82) followed by using the fact due to (29) that

$$|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}\times\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}})|\le(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}||\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|}, \tag{83}$$

we obtain

$$1-\varepsilon_n\le(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{I}}||\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}|}e^{-n\min\{\xi,\delta/2\}}, \tag{84}$$

(analogous to the last inequality in [21]) which implies (33). Since (84) holds for any sequence of $(n,\boldsymbol{R},\varepsilon_n)$-codes with $\boldsymbol{R}\notin\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$, it follows that (32) holds for all $\varepsilon\in[0,1)$.

VI. Preliminaries for Proving Theorem 2 — The Method of Gaussian Types

In this section, we generalize the definitions and results of the method of types [18, Ch. 2] to the general case. Our generalization is inspired by the previous generalizations to the Gaussian case with two variables for the guessing problem in [27, Sec. VI] and with three variables for the source coding problem in [28, Appendix D]. More specifically, we generalize the method of types to the multivariate case in order to investigate the channel coding problem for any Gaussian network. Throughout this section, we let n denote an arbitrary natural number, and let T, T_1 and T_2 denote any arbitrary subsets of $\mathcal{I}$.

A. Gaussian Types

Definition 9: The *empirical correlation* between two sequences of column vectors $x_T^n\in\mathbb{R}^{|T|\times n}$ and $y_T^n\in\mathbb{R}^{|T|\times n}$ is the $|T|\times|T|$ matrix defined as

$$\Upsilon^{[x_T^n,y_T^n]}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}x_{T,k}\,y_{T,k}^t. \tag{85}$$

The *autocorrelation* of a column vector $x_T\in\mathbb{R}^{|T|}$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{R}[x_T]\overset{\text{def}}{=}\Upsilon^{[x_T,x_T]}=x_Tx_T^t. \tag{86}$$

The *empirical autocorrelation* of a sequence of column vectors $x_T^n\in\mathbb{R}^{|T|n}$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{R}[x_T^n]\overset{\text{def}}{=}\Upsilon^{[x_T^n,x_T^n]}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{R}[x_{T,k}]. \tag{87}$$

Definition 10: The *Gaussian type* of $(x_{T_1}^n,y_{T_2}^n)\in\mathbb{R}^{|T_1|\times n}\times\mathbb{R}^{|T_2|\times n}$ is the $|T_1|\times|T_2|$ matrix

$$K^{[x_{T_1}^n,y_{T_2}^n]}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\begin{bmatrix}\Upsilon^{[x_{T_1}^n,x_{T_1}^n]} & \Upsilon^{[x_{T_1}^n,y_{T_2}^n]}\\ \Upsilon^{[y_{T_2}^n,x_{T_1}^n]} & \Upsilon^{[y_{T_2}^n,y_{T_2}^n]}\end{bmatrix}. \tag{88}$$

For any given $(n,\boldsymbol{R},\boldsymbol{P})$-code which induces the probability distribution $p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}}^n$, the peak power constraints (13) imply that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}p_{X_i^n}(x_i^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}x_{i,k}^2\le P_i\right\}\mathrm{d}x_i^n=1 \tag{89}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, which implies by the definition of $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ in (21) that the probability that the empirical autocorrelation of $X_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ falling inside $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ is 1, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})\right\} \mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n = 1. \tag{90}$$

For each $\delta > 0$ and each $N \times N$ matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$, define the δ-neighborhood of A as

$$\Gamma_\delta(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{B \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N} \,\middle|\, -\delta \cdot 1^{N\times N} \le B - A \le \delta \cdot 1^{N\times N}\right\}. \tag{91}$$

For any $\delta > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} K^{11} & K^{12} \\ K^{21} & K^{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N\times 2N} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} K^{11} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P}), \\ K^{12} - K^{11}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_\delta(0^{N\times N}), \\ K^{21} - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}K^{11} \in \Gamma_\delta(0^{N\times N}), \\ K^{22} + G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}K^{11}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}K^{12} - K^{21}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_\delta(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{92}$$

The set $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}$ can be viewed as a collection of typical Gaussian types of $(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)$ where the empirical autocorrelation of $x_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ falls inside $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ and the the empirical autocorrelation of $z_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ falls into some neighborhood of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$. The following lemma shows that the probability that the Gaussian type of $(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)$ falls outside $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}$ is exponentially small. The proof of Lemma 1 is tedious, hence is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 1: For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $\tau > 0$ which is a function of $(\boldsymbol{P}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$ such that for all sufficiently large n,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{K^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}\right\} \mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n > 1 - e^{-\tau n} \tag{93}$$

holds for any $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code where $p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}$ is the distribution induced by the code.

B. Quantizers, Types and Type Classes

In Definition 10, we have defined the Gaussian type of a given sequence. However, there are uncountably many Gaussian types. Therefore, we would like to quantize Euclidean space uniformly so that the quantization error along each dimension is less than Δ. To this end, we define Δ-quantizers in Definition 11, which will be used to approximate any covariance matrix within Δ units along each dimension.

Definition 11: Fix any positive number Δ. An $N \times N$ real-valued matrix Λ is called a Δ-*quantizer* if there exists an $N \times N$ matrix Π whose elements are integers such that

$$\Lambda = \Delta\Pi. \tag{94}$$

The set of Δ-quantizers is denoted by $\mathcal{L}^\Delta$, which can be viewed as a scaled version of the N^2-dimensional integer lattice.

Definition 12: Given any Δ-quantizer $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^\Delta$, the Δ-*Voronoi region represented by* Λ is defined as

$$\mathcal{V}_\Lambda^\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{B \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N} \,\middle|\, \Lambda \le B < \Lambda + \Delta \cdot 1^{N\times N}\right\}. \tag{95}$$

A set $\mathcal{V}$ is called a Δ-*Voronoi region* if it is a Δ-Voronoi region represented by some Λ in $\mathcal{L}^\Delta$.

By Definition 12, we can see that the size of $\mathcal{L}^\Delta$ is countably infinite and the set $\{\mathcal{V}_\Lambda^\Delta : \Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^\Delta\}$ forms a partition on $\mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$. Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ in (21), we define for each $\gamma > 0$ the set of positive definite covariance matrices

$$\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P}) \,|\, \text{For all } T \subseteq \mathcal{I}, \text{ all the eigenvalues of } K_{T\times T} \text{ are at least } \gamma\}. \tag{96}$$

In the following definition, we define a subset of $\mathcal{L}^\Delta$ called the set of input $(\Delta, \gamma, \boldsymbol{P})$-quantizers, denoted by $\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$, so that the size of $\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$ is finite.

Definition 13: The *set of input* $(\Delta, \gamma, \boldsymbol{P})$-*quantizers* is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^\Delta \,\middle|\, \mathcal{V}_\Lambda^\Delta \cap \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}) \ne \emptyset\right\}. \tag{97}$$

Definition 13 implies that

$$\bigcup_{\Lambda\in\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}} \mathcal{V}_\Lambda^\Delta \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}). \tag{98}$$

The following proposition shows that $|\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}|$ is finite, whose proof is simple and is given in Appendix B for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 2: For any $\Delta > 0$ and any $\gamma > 0$, we have

$$|\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}| \leq \prod_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \left(\left\lceil \frac{2\sqrt{P_i P_j}}{\Delta} \right\rceil + 1 \right). \tag{99}$$

We are ready to construct $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-types as follows.

Definition 14: For each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$, choose and fix one covariance matrix $K_\Lambda \in \mathcal{V}_\Lambda^\Delta \cap \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P})$ and call it the $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-*type represented by* Λ. A covariance matrix $J \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ is called a $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-*type* if it is a $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-type represented by Λ for some $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$, and we let

$$\mathcal{V}^\Delta(J) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{V}_\Lambda^\Delta \tag{100}$$

be the Δ-Voronoi region that contains J. The set of $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-type is denoted by $\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$.

The following corollary follows directly from Definition 14, (98) and Proposition 2, hence the proof is omitted.

Corollary 3: For any $\Delta > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$,

$$\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}} \mathcal{V}^\Delta(J) \supseteq \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}). \tag{101}$$

In addition,

$$|\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}| \leq \prod_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \left(\left\lceil \frac{2\sqrt{P_i P_j}}{\Delta} \right\rceil + 1 \right). \tag{102}$$

Definition 15: Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-type $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$, the *input* Δ-*type class of* J is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta)}(X_\mathcal{I}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ x_\mathcal{I}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \,\middle|\, \Upsilon^{[x_\mathcal{I}^n, x_\mathcal{I}^n]} \in \mathcal{V}^\Delta(J) \right\}. \tag{103}$$

In addition, the *joint* $(\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})$-*type class of* J is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_\mathcal{I}, Y_\mathcal{I}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (x_\mathcal{I}^n, y_\mathcal{I}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \,\middle|\, x_\mathcal{I}^n \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta)}(X_\mathcal{I}), K^{[x_\mathcal{I}^n, y_\mathcal{I}^n]} \in \mathcal{U}_{X_\mathcal{I},Y_\mathcal{I}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})} \right\}, \tag{104}$$

and the *joint* $(\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})$-*type class of* J *restricted to* (X_{T^c}, Y_{T^c}) is defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_{T^c}, Y_{T^c}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (x_{T^c}^n, y_{T^c}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{|T^c|\times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{|T^c|\times n} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists a pair } (\bar{x}_\mathcal{I}^n, \bar{y}_\mathcal{I}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_\mathcal{I}, Y_\mathcal{I}) \\ \text{such that } (\bar{x}_{T^c}^n, \bar{y}_{T^c}^n) = (x_{T^c}^n, y_{T^c}^n) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{105}$$

The proof of Theorem 2 involves the following two simple but useful bounds.

Proposition 4: Suppose $K \succ 0$ is an $N \times N$ real-valued matrix. Let $k_{\min} > 0$ be the smallest eigenvalue of K. Then, we have

$$K^{-1} \in \Gamma_{\frac{N}{k_{\min}}}(0^{N\times N}) \tag{106}$$

Proof: The desired result can be obtained by diagonalizing K followed by inverting the diagonalized matrix. ∎

Proposition 5: Suppose Π_1 and Π_2 are $N_1 \times N_2$ and $N_2 \times N_3$ real-valued matrices respectively. Let

$$\pi_i^{\max} = \max\{|r| : r \text{ is an entry in } \Pi_i\} \tag{107}$$

for each $i \in \{1,2\}$. Then, we have

$$\Pi_1\Pi_2 \in \Gamma_{N_2\pi_1^{\max}\pi_2^{\max}}(0^{N_1\times N_3}). \tag{108}$$

Proof: The desired result can be obtained by using the facts that $\Pi_1 \in \Gamma_{\pi_1^{\max}}(0^{N_1\times N_2})$ and $\Pi_2 \in \Gamma_{\pi_2^{\max}}(0^{N_2\times N_3})$. ∎

In the proof of Theorem 2, a key step involves the following lemma which bounds the product probabilities $\prod_{k=1}^n q_{Y_{T^c}|X_\mathcal{I}}(y_{T^c,k}|x_{\mathcal{I},k})$ for each $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-type $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$ and each $(x_\mathcal{I}^n, y_\mathcal{I}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_\mathcal{I}, Y_\mathcal{I})$. Since the proof of Lemma 6 is tedious, it is relegated to Appendix C.

Lemma 6: Let $\sigma_{\min}$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$. Fix any $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, and fix any $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})$-type $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$. Then for each $(x_\mathcal{I}^n, y_\mathcal{I}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_\mathcal{I}, Y_\mathcal{I})$, we have

$$\prod_{k=1}^n q_{Y_{T^c}|X_\mathcal{I}}(y_{T^c,k}|x_{\mathcal{I},k}) \leq e^{-n\left(\frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi e)^{|T^c|}|\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}|\right) - \frac{\delta N^3}{2\sigma_{\min}}\right)}. \tag{109}$$

VII. Proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we will show that for all $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$

$$\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}} \tag{110}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ is as defined in (22). It suffices to show that for any $\boldsymbol{R} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ and any sequence of $(\bar{n}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-codes, the limit of the error probabilities must satisfy

$$\lim_{\bar{n}\to\infty} \varepsilon_{\bar{n}} = 1. \tag{111}$$

To this end, we fix a rate vector $\boldsymbol{R} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ and a sequence of $(\bar{n}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-codes.

A. Relating $\boldsymbol{R}$ to the Cut-Set Bound

Since $\boldsymbol{R} \notin \mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ is closed, it follows by the definition of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cut-set}}$ in (22) that we can always find a positive number $\eta > 0$ such that for any covariance matrix $K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$, there exists a $V_{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ that satisfies

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in V_K \times V_K^c} R_{i,j} \geq \frac{1}{2}\log\left|I_{|V_K^c|} + G_{V_K^c\times V_K} K_{V_K|V_K^c} G_{V_K^c\times V_K}^t \left(\Sigma_{V_K^c\times V_K^c}\right)^{-1}\right| + \eta \tag{112}$$

where the shorthand notation V_K is used to denote $V_{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}$ and $K_{V_K|V_K^c}$ is as defined in (20). Define

$$\eta(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\delta N^2}{2\sigma_{\min}}\left(\delta N + (2N g_{\max}+1)\delta + \frac{2N^4 g_{\max}(1+\delta)P_{\max}}{P_{\min}} + 1\right) \tag{113}$$

where $P_{\min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{i\in\mathcal{I}} P_i > 0$, $P_{\max} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} P_i > 0$ and $\sigma_{\min} > 0$ is defined as the smallest eigenvalue of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$. Then, we can always find a sufficiently small number $\delta > 0$ such that for any covariance matrix $K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{S}((1+\delta)\boldsymbol{P})$, the following inequality holds:

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in V_K\times V_K^c} (1-\delta)R_{i,j} \geq \frac{1}{2}\log\left|I_{|V_K^c|} + G_{V_K^c\times V_K} K_{V_K|V_K^c} G_{V_K^c\times V_K}^t \left(\Sigma_{V_K^c\times V_K^c}\right)^{-1}\right| + 2\eta(\delta). \tag{114}$$

In particular, if $K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succ 0$, then $K_{V_K|V_K^c}$ in (114) admits the closed-form expression

$$K_{V_K|V_K^c} = K_{V_K\times V_K} - K_{V_K\times V_K^c}(K_{V_K^c\times V_K^c})^{-1} K_{V_K^c\times V_K} \tag{115}$$

by the conditional variance formula for multivariate normal distributions in [29, Sec. 8.1.3].

B. Appending N Redundant Transmissions

In this proof, the quantity $K_{V_K|V_K^c}$ in (114) is closely related $\mathrm{R}[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n]$, i.e., the empirical autocorrelation of $X_{\mathcal{I}}^n$. Since $K_{V_K|V_K^c}$ has a simple closed-form expression (115) if $K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succ 0$, we are going to carefully append N redundant transmissions to every $(\bar{n}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-code so that $\mathrm{R}[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n] \succ 0$ with probability 1 for the resultant length-$(\bar{n}+N)$ code. To this end, we consider each sufficiently large $\bar{n}$ that satisfies

$$\bar{n}R_{i,j} \geq (\bar{n}+N)(1-\delta)R_{i,j} \tag{116}$$

for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$ and the corresponding $(\bar{n}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-code which has been fixed above, and construct an $(\bar{n}+N, (1-\delta)\boldsymbol{R}, (1+\delta)\boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-code as follows. In the first $\bar{n}$ time slots, the $(\bar{n}+N, (1-\delta)\boldsymbol{R}, (1+\delta)\boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-code is identical to the $(\bar{n}, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}, \varepsilon_{\bar{n}})$-code except that the sizes of the message alphabets of the constructed code are slightly smaller due to (116). In the last N time slots, the N nodes transmit redundant information sequentially in this manner: In the i^{th} last time slot for each $i \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$, only node i transmits the non-zero symbol $\sqrt{\delta(\bar{n}+N)P_{\min}}$.

To simplify notation, let $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{n}+N$, $\varepsilon_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon_{\bar{n}}$ and $\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1+\delta)\boldsymbol{P}$. For each $(n, (1-\delta)\boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)}, \varepsilon_n)$-code constructed above, let $p_{W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, X_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n, \hat{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}$ be the induced probability distribution. By (96) and the construction above, we have for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{S}_{\delta P_{\min}}(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})\right\}\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n = 1, \tag{117}$$

which implies that $\mathrm{R}[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n] \succ 0$ with probability 1 for the $(n, (1-\delta)\boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)}, \varepsilon_n)$-code.

C. Simplifying the Correct Decoding Probability by Using the Memoryless Property

Fix a sufficiently large n such that (116) holds,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{K^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}\in\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n > 1-e^{-\tau n} \tag{118}$$

holds for some $\tau>0$ as a consequence of Lemma 1, and

$$\frac{1}{n}\left(N^2g_{\max}^2+2N^5\left(\frac{g_{\max}(1+\delta)P_{\max}}{\delta P_{\min}}\right)+N^8\left(\frac{g_{\max}(1+\delta)P_{\max}}{\delta P_{\min}}\right)^2\right)\le\delta \tag{119}$$

holds where

$$g_{\max}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\max\{|g|: g \text{ is an entry in } G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\}. \tag{120}$$

Unless specified otherwise, the probabilities are evaluated according to $p_{W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\hat{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}$ in the rest of the proof. By Lemma 1 and the union bound, the probability of correct decoding can be bounded above as

$$\begin{aligned}
&1-\varepsilon_n\\
&=\Pr\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i\left(W_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},Y_i^n\right)=W_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\right\} &(121)\\
&\le\Pr\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i\left(W_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},Y_i^n\right)=W_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\cap\left\{K^{[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}\in\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}\right\}\cap\left\{\mathrm{R}[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n]\in\mathcal{S}_{\delta P_{\min}}(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})\right\}\right\}+e^{-\tau n} &(122)\\
&=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\Pr\left\{\begin{array}{l}\bigcap\limits_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i\left(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},Y_i^n\right)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\\ \cap\left\{K^{[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}\in\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}\right\}\cap\left\{\mathrm{R}[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n]\in\mathcal{S}_{\delta P_{\min}}(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})\right\}\end{array}\middle|\, W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\right\}+e^{-\tau n}. &(123)
\end{aligned}$$

With a slight abuse of notation, we let

$$f_{T,k}(w_{T\times\mathcal{I}},y_T^{k-1})\overset{\text{def}}{=}\left[f_{i,k}(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^{k-1}):i\in T\right]^t \tag{124}$$

be a $|T|$ dimensional column vector for each $T\subseteq\mathcal{I}$ and each $k\in\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, and let

$$f_T(w_{T\times\mathcal{I}},y_T^{n-1})\overset{\text{def}}{=}(f_{T,1}(w_{T\times\mathcal{I}},y_T^0),f_{T,2}(w_{T\times\mathcal{I}},y_T^1),\ldots,f_{T,n}(w_{T\times\mathcal{I}},y_T^{n-1})). \tag{125}$$

In addition, define the events

$$\mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\left\{\varphi_i(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}, \tag{126}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\left\{K^{[f_{\mathcal{I}}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}),y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}\in\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}\right\} \tag{127}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\left\{\mathrm{R}[f_{\mathcal{I}}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1})]\in\mathcal{S}_{\delta P_{\min}}(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})\right\} \tag{128}$$

to simplify notation. In order to simplify the RHS of (123), we write for each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\left\{\varphi_i\left(w_{\{i\}\times\mathcal{I}},Y_i^n\right)=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\{i\}}\right\}\cap\left\{K^{[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}\in\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}\right\}\cap\left\{\mathrm{R}[X_{\mathcal{I}}^n]\in\mathcal{S}_{\delta P_{\min}}(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})\right\}\middle|\, W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\right\}\\
&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}p_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n|W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}(y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n}\right\}\mathbf{1}\left\{\mathcal{G}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}\right\}\mathbf{1}\left\{\mathcal{H}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n &(129)\\
&\overset{\text{(a)}}{=}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n}\right\}\mathbf{1}\left\{\mathcal{G}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}\right\}\mathbf{1}\left\{\mathcal{H}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n &(130)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact due to Definitions 7 and 8 that

$$p_{Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n|W_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}=w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}(y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)=\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})) \tag{131}$$

for all $y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$.

D. Further Simplifying the Correct Decoding Probability by Using the Method of Gaussian Types

Define

$$\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta P_{\min} \tag{132}$$

and

$$\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/n. \tag{133}$$

For each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ and each $(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})$-type $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$, we define

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \,\middle|\, \left(f_{\mathcal{I}}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}), y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\right) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}) \right\} \tag{134}$$

and define for each $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ and each $w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}$

$$\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ y_{T^c}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{|T^c|\times n} \,\middle|\, (f_{T^c}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{T^c}^{n-1}), y_{T^c}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}) \right\}. \tag{135}$$

Since

$$\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}} \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}) \supseteq \left\{ (x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n) \in \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})} \,\middle|\, \Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)}) \right\} \tag{136}$$

by (101) and the definitions of $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$, $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})$, $\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}})$ and $\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$ in (92), (96) and Definition 15 and Definition 14 respectively, it together with the definition of $\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)$ in (134) implies that $\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}} \mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)$ covers

$$\left\{ y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n} \,\middle|\, K^{[f_{\mathcal{I}}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}),y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}, \mathrm{R}[f_{\mathcal{I}}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1})] \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)}) \right\} \tag{137}$$

for each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$, which implies that the RHS of (130) can be bounded above as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n} \right\} \mathbf{1}\left\{ \mathcal{G}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^n} \right\} \mathbf{1}\left\{ \mathcal{H}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{n-1}} \right\} \mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \\
&\le \sum_{J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}} \int_{\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n} \right\} \mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

Combining (123), (130) and (138), we conclude that the probability of correct decoding satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&1-\varepsilon_n \\
&\le e^{-\tau n} + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|} \sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \sum_{J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}} \int_{\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})) \mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n} \right\} \mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

E. Bounding the Correct Decoding Probability in Terms of $\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$

Fix any arbitrary $T \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. Define

$$a_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi e)^{|T^c|}|\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}|\right) - \frac{\delta^2 N^3}{2\sigma_{\min}} \tag{140}$$

to simplify notation where $\sigma_{\min} > 0$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$. In order to simplify the RHS of (139), we consider the innermost product. In particular, we consider the following chain of equalities for each $w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$, each $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$ and each $y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \in \mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})) \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T^c,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{T^c,k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1})) p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}), y_{T^c,k}) &(141)\\
&\stackrel{\text{(b)}}{\le} e^{-na_T} \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}), y_{T^c,k}) &(142)
\end{aligned}$$

where (b) follows from Lemma 6. Following similar procedures for proving the chain of inequalities leading to (52), we obtain the following inequality for each $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$:

$$\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \int_{\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)} \prod_{k=1}^{n} p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n$$

$$\overset{(142)}{=} e^{-na_T}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}} \int_{\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)} \prod_{k=1}^{n} p_{Y_{T,k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k},Y_{T^c,k}}(y_{T,k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}),y_{T^c,k})\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in T^c}\mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n \quad (143)$$

$$\le e^{-na_T}\sum_{w_{(T\times T^c)^c}\in\mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}} \int_{\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)} 1\,\mathrm{d}y_{T^c}^n \quad (144)$$

F. Bounding the Volume of $\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$

In order to specify certain submatrices of $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$, we will also use $J_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ to denote J as long as no confusion arises. For each $J = J_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$, we let

$$\phi_{X_{T^c},Y_{T^c}}(x_{T^c},y_{T^c}) \equiv \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{bmatrix}x_{T^c}\\ y_{T^c}\end{bmatrix};\mathbf{0}_{2|T^c|},\begin{bmatrix}J_{T^c\times T^c} & J_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t\\ G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c} & G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t+\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}\end{bmatrix}\right) \quad (145)$$

denote the multivariate normal distribution in order to obtain an upper bound on the volume of $\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$. For each $w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}$ and each $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$, since the smallest eigenvalue of J is at least $\gamma > 0$ by the definition of $\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$ in (96), it follows from Proposition 4 that

$$(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1} \in \Gamma_{\frac{N}{\gamma}}(0^{N\times N}), \quad (146)$$

and it is well known [29, Sec. 8.1.3] that

$$\phi_{Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c}}(y_{T^c}|x_{T^c}) \equiv \mathcal{N}(y_{T^c};\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(x_{T^c};J),\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)) \quad (147)$$

where

$$\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(x_{T^c};J) \overset{\text{def}}{=} G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}\left(J_{T^c\times T^c}\right)^{-1}x_{T^c} \quad (148)$$

and

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J) \overset{\text{def}}{=} G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t + \Sigma_{T^c\times T^c} - G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}\left(J_{T^c\times T^c}\right)^{-1}J_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t. \quad (149)$$

In the rest of this subsection, we aim to show that the exponent of the volume of $\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$ is close to $\frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi e)^{|T^c|}|\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)|\right)$. To this end, we write for each $w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}$ and each $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$

$$\int_{\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)} \prod_{k=1}^{n}\phi_{Y_{T^c}|X_{T^c}}(y_{T^c,k}|f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1}))\mathrm{d}y_{T^c}^n \le 1 \quad (150)$$

(recall the definition of $\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$ in (135)), which implies by using (147), (148) and (149) that

$$\int_{\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)} e^{-n\left(\frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi)^{|T^c|}|\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)|\right)+\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{tr}\left((\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J))^{-1}\mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1});J)]\right)\right)}\mathrm{d}y_{T^c}^n \le 1. \quad (151)$$

Fix any $w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{W}_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}$ and any $J \in \mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$. In order to obtain a lower bound on the LHS of (151), we consider for each $y_{T^c}^n \in \mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}),y_{T^c}^{k-1};J)]$$

$$=\Upsilon^{[y_{T^c}^n,y_{T^c}^n]}-2\Upsilon^{\left[y_{T^c}^n,G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}f_{T^c}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{n-1})\right]}+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{R}[G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1})]. \quad (152)$$

Recalling the definitions of $\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$, $\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{T^c},Y_{T^c})$, $\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}})$ and $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$ in (135), (105), (104) and (92) respectively, we conclude that for each $y_{T^c}^n \in \mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)$, there exists a pair $(\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}(X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}})$ such that

$$(\bar{x}_{T^c}^n,\bar{y}_{T^c}^n) = (f_{T^c}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{n-1}),y_{T^c}^n), \tag{153}$$

$$\mathrm{R}[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n] \in \mathcal{V}^{\Delta}(J) \tag{154}$$

and

$$K^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}. \tag{155}$$

It follows from (155), the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$ in (92) and Proposition 5 that

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_{(2Ng_{\max}+1)\delta^2}(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{R}[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t+\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}) \tag{156}$$

and

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_{\delta^2}(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{R}[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]), \tag{157}$$

whose derivations are provided in Appendix D for the sake of completeness. Combining (154), (156) and (157), we conclude that there exists a $Q_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^{\Delta} \in \Gamma_{\Delta}(0^{N\times N})$ such that

$$\mathrm{R}[\bar{x}_{T^c}^n] = J_{T^c\times T^c} + Q_{T^c\times T^c}^{\Delta}, \tag{158}$$

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{T^c}^n,\bar{y}_{T^c}^n]} \in \Gamma_{(2Ng_{\max}+1)\delta^2}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}(J+Q_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^{\Delta})G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t+\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}), \tag{159}$$

and

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{T^c}^n,\bar{x}_{T^c}^n]} \in \Gamma_{\delta^2}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}(J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}+Q_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}^{\Delta})). \tag{160}$$

Since

$$G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}Q_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^{\Delta}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_{N^2g_{\max}^2\Delta}(0^{T^c\times T^c}) \tag{161}$$

and

$$G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}Q_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^{\Delta} \in \Gamma_{Ng_{\max}\Delta}(0^{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}) \tag{162}$$

by Proposition 5, it follows from (159) and (160) that

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{T^c}^n,\bar{y}_{T^c}^n]} \in \Gamma_{(2Ng_{\max}+1)\delta^2+N^2g_{\max}^2\Delta}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}JG_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t+\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}) \tag{163}$$

and

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{T^c}^n,\bar{x}_{T^c}^n]} \in \Gamma_{\delta^2+Ng_{\max}\Delta}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}) \tag{164}$$

Following (152), we use (153), (158), (163), (164), (146), the fact that $J \in \Gamma_{(1+\delta)P_{\max}}(0^{N\times N})$ and Proposition 5 to obtain

$$\Upsilon^{[y_{T^c}^n,y_{T^c}^n]} \in \Gamma_{(2Ng_{\max}+1)\delta^2+N^2g_{\max}^2\Delta}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}JG_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t+\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}), \tag{165}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\Upsilon^{\left[y_{T^c}^n,G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}f_{T^c}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{n-1})\right]}\\&\in \Gamma_{N^4g_{\max}(\delta^2+Ng_{\max}\Delta)(1+\delta)P_{\max}/\gamma}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}J_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t)\end{aligned} \tag{166}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{R}[G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1})]\\&\in \Gamma_{\Delta(N^4g_{\max}(1+\delta)P_{\max}/\gamma)^2}(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}J_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t).\end{aligned} \tag{167}$$

To simplify notation, define

$$\kappa(\delta,\Delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2Ng_{\max}+1)\delta^2+N^2g_{\max}^2\Delta+2N^4g_{\max}(\delta^2+Ng_{\max}\Delta)(1+\delta)P_{\max}/\gamma+\Delta\left(N^4g_{\max}(1+\delta)P_{\max}/\gamma\right)^2. \tag{168}$$

Combining (152), (165), (166), (167) and (168), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1});J)]\\&\in\Gamma_{\kappa(\delta,\Delta)}\left(G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}JG_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t+\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}-G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}J_{\mathcal{I}\times T^c}(J_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}J_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}^t\right),\end{aligned}\tag{169}$$

which implies by (149) that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1});J)]\in\Gamma_{\kappa(\delta,\Delta)}\left(\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)\right).\tag{170}$$

Since

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)=G_{T^c\times T}\left(J_{T\times T}-J_{T\times T^c}\left(J_{T^c\times T^c}\right)^{-1}J_{T^c\times T}\right)G_{T^c\times T}^t+\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}\tag{171}$$

by simplifying (149), it follows that all the eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)$ are at least $\sigma_{\min}$, which implies by Proposition 4 that

$$(\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J))^{-1}\in\Gamma_{\frac{N}{\sigma_{\min}}}(0^{T^c\times T^c}).\tag{172}$$

Therefore, it follows from (170), (172) and Proposition 4 that

$$\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathrm{tr}\left((\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J))^{-1}\mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-\hat{\mu}_{T^c}(f_{T^c,k}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}},y_{T^c}^{k-1});J)]\right)-|T^c|\right|\le\frac{N^2\kappa(\delta,\Delta)}{\sigma_{\min}},\tag{173}$$

which together with (151) implies that

$$\int_{\mathcal{F}_T^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}};J)}1\,\mathrm{d}y_{T^c}^n\le e^{n\left(\frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi e)^{|T^c|}|\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)|\right)+\frac{N^2\kappa(\delta,\Delta)}{2\sigma_{\min}}\right)}.\tag{174}$$

1) Showing the Exponential Decay of the Probability of Correct Decoding: Combining (144), (140) and (174) and using the fact due to (2) that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{W}_{(T\times T^c)^c}|}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}=\frac{1}{\prod\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}\lceil e^{n(1-\delta)R_{i,j}}\rceil}\le e^{-n\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}(1-\delta)R_{i,j}},\tag{175}$$

we have for each $J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}|}\sum_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\in\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}}\int_{\mathcal{A}^{(\Delta,\delta^2)}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}};J)}\prod_{k=1}^{n}p_{Y_{\mathcal{I},k}|X_{\mathcal{I},k}}(y_{\mathcal{I},k}|f_{\mathcal{I},k}(w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_{\mathcal{I}}^{k-1}))\mathbf{1}\left\{\bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{E}_{w_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}},y_i^n}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\\&\le e^{-n\left(\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}(1-\delta)R_{i,j}-\frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{|\hat{\Sigma}_{T^c}(J)|}{|\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}|}\right)-\frac{\delta^2N^3+N^2\kappa(\delta,\Delta)}{2\sigma_{\min}}\right)}.\end{aligned}\tag{176}$$

Using (113), (119), (132), (133) and (168), we have

$$\frac{\delta^2N^3+N^2\kappa(\delta,\Delta)}{2\sigma_{\min}}\le\eta(\delta)\tag{177}$$

Combining (139), (171), (176) and (177), we have

$$1-\varepsilon_n\le e^{-\tau n}+\sum_{J\in\mathcal{P}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}}e^{-n\left(\sum\limits_{(i,j)\in T\times T^c}(1-\delta)R_{i,j}-\frac{1}{2}\log\left|I_{|T^c|}+G_{T^c\times T}J_{T|T^c}G_{T^c\times T}^t(\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}\right|-\eta(\delta)\right)}\tag{178}$$

for any $T\subseteq\mathcal{I}$ where $J_{T|T^c}\overset{\text{def}}{=}J_{T\times T}-J_{T\times T^c}\left(J_{T^c\times T^c}\right)^{-1}J_{T^c\times T}$. Combining (114), (115), (133), Proposition 2 and (178), we have

$$\begin{aligned}1-\varepsilon_n&\le e^{-\tau n}+\prod_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\left(\left\lceil2n\sqrt{P_iP_j}\right\rceil+1\right)e^{-n\eta(\delta)}&(179)\\&\le e^{-\tau n}+n^{N^2}(2P_{\max}+1)^{N^2}e^{-n\eta(\delta)}.&(180)\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, (111) holds by (180) and hence (110) holds.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Before proving Lemma 1, we need to prove two preliminary results. The following proposition states that the probability that the empirical autocorrelation of $Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ falls outside $\Gamma_\delta(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$ is exponentially small. The proof of Proposition 7 is due to the theory of large deviations [30] and is provided here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 7: Let $p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}}(z_{\mathcal{I}}) = \mathcal{N}(z_{\mathcal{I}}; \mathbf{0}_N, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$ for all $z_{\mathcal{I}}$, let $Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ be n independent copies of $Z_{\mathcal{I}} \sim p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}}$, and let $p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n}$ be the distribution of $Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n$, i.e.,

$$p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(z_{\mathcal{I}}^n) = \prod_{k=1}^n p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}}(z_{\mathcal{I},k}) \tag{181}$$

for all $z_{\mathcal{I}}^n$. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $\tau > 0$ which is a function of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ such that for all sufficiently large n,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(z_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[z_{\mathcal{I}}^n, z_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_\delta(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})\right\} \mathrm{d}z_{\mathcal{I}}^n > 1 - e^{-\tau n}. \tag{182}$$

Proof: Let $t > 0$ be any real number. Consider the following chain of inequalities for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$, where all the probability and expectation terms are evaluated according to $p_{Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n}$:

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k} - \mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}]\right| > \delta\right\} = 2\Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k} > \mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}] + \delta\right\} \tag{183}$$

$$\overset{\text{(a)}}{\leq} \frac{2\left(\mathrm{E}[e^{tZ_{i,k}Z_{j,k}}]\right)^n}{e^{tn(\mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}]+\delta)}} \tag{184}$$

$$= 2e^{tn\left(\frac{1}{t}\log \mathrm{E}[e^{tZ_{i,k}Z_{j,k}}] - \mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}] - \delta\right)} \tag{185}$$

where (a) follows from Chernoff's bound. Since

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{1}{t}\log \mathrm{E}[e^{tZ_{i,k}Z_{j,k}}] = \mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}], \tag{186}$$

there exists a sufficiently small $t_{ij} > 0$ which is a function of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{t_{ij}}\log \mathrm{E}[e^{t_{ij}Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}}] - \mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}] \leq \delta/2, \tag{187}$$

which implies by using (185) that

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k} - \mathrm{E}[Z_{i,k}Z_{j,k}]\right| > \delta\right\} \leq 2e^{-t_{ij}\delta n/2}. \tag{188}$$

Since there exists a finite set of positive numbers $\{t_{ij} > 0 \,|\, (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}\}$ such that (188) holds for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}$, we conclude that (182) holds for all sufficiently large n by choosing $\tau \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\delta}{4}\min_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\{t_{ij}\}$. ■

The following proposition states that the probability that the empirical correlation between $X_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ and $Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n$ falls outside $\Gamma_\delta(0^{N\times N})$ is exponentially small. The proof of Proposition 8 is based on Chernoff's bound and the peak power constraints (13).

Proposition 8: For any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $\tau > 0$ which is a function of $(\boldsymbol{P}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}})$ such that for all sufficiently large n,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, z_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, z_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_\delta(0^{N\times N})\right\} \mathrm{d}z_{\mathcal{I}}^n \mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n > 1 - e^{-\tau n} \tag{189}$$

holds for any $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code where $p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n}$ is the distribution induced by the code.

Proof: Let $t > 0$ be any real number. Let $\sigma_j^2 > 0$ be the variance of $Z_{j,k}$ for each $j \in \mathcal{I}$ and each $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Fix a $\delta > 0$ and any $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code. Consider the following chain of inequalities for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$, where all the probability and expectation terms are evaluated according to the distribution induced by the $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code (cf. (14)):

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k}\right| > \delta\right\} = 2\Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k} > \delta\right\} \tag{190}$$

$$\overset{\text{(a)}}{\leq} \frac{2\mathrm{E}\left[e^{t\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k}}\right]}{e^{\delta t n}} \tag{191}$$

$$\overset{\text{(b)}}{\leq} \frac{2}{e^{\delta t n}}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{t\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k} + \frac{t^2\sigma_j^2}{2}\sum_{k=1}^n (P_i - X_{i,k}^2)}\right] \tag{192}$$

where

(a) follows from Chernoff's bound.

(b) follows from the peak power constraint (13).

Since $Z_{j,k}$ is independent of (X_i^k, Z_j^{k-1}) for each $k \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, straightforward calculations reveal that

$$\mathrm{E}\left[e^{t\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k} - \frac{t^2\sigma_j^2}{2}\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}^2}\right] = 1. \tag{193}$$

Combining (192) and (193), we have for each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k}\right| > \delta\right\} \le \frac{2e^{\sigma_j^2 t_{ij}^2 nP_i/2}}{e^{\delta t_{ij} n}} \tag{194}$$

for any $t_{ij} > 0$, which implies by choosing $t_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\delta}{\sigma_j^2 P_i}$ that

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n X_{i,k}Z_{j,k}\right| > \delta\right\} \le 2e^{-\frac{\delta^2 n}{2\sigma_j^2 P_i}} \tag{195}$$

for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}$. Consequently, (189) holds for all sufficiently large n by choosing $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\delta^2}{4\max\limits_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\sigma_j^2 P_i}$. ■

We are ready to present the proof of Lemma 1. Fix a $\delta > 0$ and any $(n, \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{P})$-code. Let $p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Z_{\mathcal{I}}^n, Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}$ be the distribution induced by the code (cf. (14)). Using the union bound, (90), the definition of $K^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}$ in (88) and the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}$ in (92), we have for all sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{K^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \notin \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \notin \Gamma_\delta(0^{N\times N})\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \notin \Gamma_\delta(0^{N\times N})\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{\Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} + G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \notin \Gamma_\delta(\Sigma)\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{196}$$

Using Definition 9 and letting $z_{\mathcal{I}}^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_{\mathcal{I}}^n - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n$, we have

$$\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t = \Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,z_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}, \tag{197}$$

$$\Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} = \Upsilon^{[z_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \tag{198}$$

and

$$\Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} + G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t = \Upsilon^{[z_{\mathcal{I}}^n,z_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}. \tag{199}$$

Combining the channel law (14), (196), (197), (198), (199) and applying Proposition 7 and Proposition 8, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{N\times n}} p_{X_{\mathcal{I}}^n,Y_{\mathcal{I}}^n}(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n)\mathbf{1}\left\{K^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \notin \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}\right\}\mathrm{d}y_{\mathcal{I}}^n\mathrm{d}x_{\mathcal{I}}^n \le e^{-\lambda n} \tag{200}$$

for some $\lambda > 0$ that depends on $\boldsymbol{P}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}$. This completes the proof.

Appendix B
Proof of Proposition 2

Fix a $\Delta > 0$ and a $\gamma > 0$. Since $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ defined in (21) is a set of covariance matrices, it follows that $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P})$ is a bounded set that is contained in

$$\bar{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{P}) = \left\{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succeq 0 \text{ where the } ij^{\text{th}} \text{ element } k_{ij} \text{ satisfies } |k_{ij}| \le \sqrt{P_iP_j} \\ \text{for all } (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}\end{array}\right\}. \tag{201}$$

Define

$$\bar{\mathcal{S}}^{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{P}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N} \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} K_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \succeq 0 \text{ where the } ij^{\text{th}} \text{ element } k_{ij} \text{ satisfies } |k_{ij}| \le \left\lceil\frac{\sqrt{P_iP_j}}{\Delta}\right\rceil\Delta \\ \text{for all } (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}\end{array}\right\}. \tag{202}$$

Since $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{P}) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{P}) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{S}}^{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{P})$ and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}^{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{P})$ contains at most $\prod_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \left(2\left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{P_iP_j}}{\Delta}\right\rceil + 1\right)$ Δ-quantizers (cf. Definition 11), it follows that $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\boldsymbol{P})$ contains at most $\prod_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \left(2\left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{P_iP_j}}{\Delta}\right\rceil + 1\right)$ Δ-quantizers, which together with the definition of $\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}$ in (97) implies that

$$|\mathcal{L}^{(\Delta,\gamma,\boldsymbol{P})}| \le \prod_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}} \left(\left\lceil \frac{2\sqrt{P_iP_j}}{\Delta}\right\rceil + 1\right). \tag{203}$$

Appendix C
Proof of Lemma 6

For each $(x_{\mathcal{I}}^n, y_{\mathcal{I}}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\mathcal{I}})$, consider

$$\prod_{k=1}^n q_{Y_{T^c}|X_{\mathcal{I}}}(y_{T^c,k}|x_{\mathcal{I},k}) \overset{\text{(a)}}{=} \prod_{k=1}^n \mathcal{N}(y_{T^c,k}; G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}, \Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}) \tag{204}$$

$$\overset{(1)}{=} e^{-n\left(\frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi)^{|T^c|}|\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}|\right)+\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{tr}\left((\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}\mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}]\right)\right)} \tag{205}$$

$$= e^{-n\left(\frac{1}{2}\log\left((2\pi)^{|T^c|}|\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}|\right)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\left((\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k}-G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}]\right)\right)} \tag{206}$$

where (a) is due to Definition 8. By the definitions of $\mathcal{T}_J^{(n,\Delta,\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}(X_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\mathcal{I}})$ and $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta,\boldsymbol{P})}$ in (104) and (92) respectively, we have

$$\Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} + G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[x_{\mathcal{I}}^n,y_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[y_{\mathcal{I}}^n,x_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_\delta(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}), \tag{207}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{R}[y_{\mathcal{I},k} - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}] \in \Gamma_\delta(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}), \tag{208}$$

which then implies that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k} - G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}] \in \Gamma_\delta(\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c}). \tag{209}$$

Using (209), Proposition 5 and Proposition 4, we obtain

$$(\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k} - G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}] \in \Gamma_{\frac{\delta N^2}{\sigma_{\min}}}(I_{T^c}). \tag{210}$$

Since

$$\left|\mathrm{tr}\left((\Sigma_{T^c\times T^c})^{-1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{R}[y_{T^c,k} - G_{T^c\times\mathcal{I}}x_{\mathcal{I},k}]\right) - |T^c|\right| \le \frac{\delta N^3}{\sigma_{\min}} \tag{211}$$

by (210), it follows from (206) that (109) holds.

Appendix D
Derivations of (156) and (157)

Suppose $(\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n, \bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n)$ satisfies (155), i.e.,

$$K^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}. \tag{212}$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{X_{\mathcal{I}},Y_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(\delta^2,\boldsymbol{P}^{(\delta)})}$ in (92), we have

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_{\delta^2}(0^{N\times N}), \tag{213}$$

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_{\delta^2}(0^{N\times N}) \tag{214}$$

and

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} + G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t - G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} - \Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_{\delta^2}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}), \tag{215}$$

which implies by Proposition 5 that

$$G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_{Ng_{\max}\delta^2}\left(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t\right), \tag{216}$$

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t \in \Gamma_{Ng_{\max}\delta^2}\left(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t\right) \tag{217}$$

and

$$\Upsilon^{[\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{y}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]} \in \Gamma_{(2Ng_{\max}+1)\delta^2}\left(G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\Upsilon^{[\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n,\bar{x}_{\mathcal{I}}^n]}G_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}^t + \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}\times\mathcal{I}}\right). \tag{218}$$

Consequently, (157) and (156) follow from (214) and (218) respectively.

REFERENCES

[1] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
[2] A. El Gamal, "On information flow in relay networks," in *Proc. IEEE National Telecom Conference*, vol. 2, Nov. 1981, pp. D4.1.1–D4.1.4.
[3] T. Cover and A. El Gamal, "Capacity theorems for the relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 572–84, 1979.
[4] M. Aleksic, P. Razaghi, and W. Yu, "Capacity of a class of modulo-sum relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 921–930, 2009.
[5] G. Kramer, M. Gastpar, and P. Gupta, "Cooperative strategies and capacity theorems for relay networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 3037–3063, 2005.
[6] M. R. Aref, "Information flow in relay networks," Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Statistics, Stanford University, CA, 1980.
[7] A. El Gamal and M. R. Aref, "The capacity of the semideterministic relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 28, no. 3, p. 536, 1982.
[8] A. El Gamal and S. Zahedi, "Capacity of a class of relay channels with orthogonal components," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 1815–1817, 2005.
[9] A. S. Avestimehr, S. N. Diggavi, and D. N. C. Tse, "Wireless network information flow: A deterministic approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 1872–1905, 2011.
[10] A. Behboodi and P. Piantanida, "On the asymptotic error probability of composite relay channels," in *Proc. IEEE Intl. Symp. Inf. Theory*, St Petersburg, Russia, Jul./Aug. 2011, pp. 1524 – 1528.
[11] ——, "On the asymptotic spectrum of the error probability of composite networks," in *Proc. IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop*, Lausanne, Switzerland, Sep. 2012, pp. 148 – 152.
[12] A. Behboodi, "Cooperative networks with channel uncertainty," Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Telecommunications, Supélec (École Supérieure d'Électricité), 2012. [Online]. Available: http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00765429
[13] T. S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Feb 2003.
[14] S. L. Fong and V. Y. F. Tan, "Strong converse theorems for classes of multimessage multicast networks: A Rényi divergence approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4953 – 4967, 2016.
[15] Y. Polyanskiy and S. Verdú, "Arimoto channel coding converse and Rényi divergence," in *Proc. Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing*, Sep. 2010, pp. 1327 – 1333.
[16] R. Kötter, M. Effros, and M. Médard, "A theory of network equivalence — Part I: Point-to-point channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 972–995, 2011.
[17] A. F. Dana, R. Gowaikar, R. Palanki, B. Hassibi, and M. Effros, "Capacity of wireless erasure networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 789–804, 2006.
[18] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
[19] S. L. Fong and V. Y. F. Tan, "Achievable rates for Gaussian degraded relay channels with non-vanishing error probabilities," *submitted to IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Apr. 2016, arXiv:1604.01566.
[20] L. V. Truong, S. L. Fong, and V. Y. F. Tan, "On Gaussian channels with feedback under expected power constraints and with non-vanishing error probabilities," *accepted to IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Dec. 2016, arXiv:1512.05088.
[21] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Feedback does not affect the reliability function of a DMC at rates above capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 92–93, 1982.
[22] L. H. Ozarow, "The capacity of the white Gaussian multiple access channel with feedback," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 623–629, 1984.
[23] K. Marton, "A simple proof of the blowing-up lemma," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 445–446, 1986.
[24] Y. Oohama, "Strong converse exponent for degraded broadcast channels at rates outside the capacity region," Apr. 2015, arXiv:1504.05941.
[25] ——, "New strong converse for asymmetric broadcast channels," Apr. 2016, arXiv:1604.02901.
[26] V. Y. F. Tan, "On the reliability function of the discrete memoryless relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1550–1573, 2015.
[27] E. Arıkan and N. Merhav, "Guessing subject to distortion," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 1041 – 1056, 1998.
[28] B. G. Kelly and A. B. Wagner, "Reliability in source coding with side information," Sep. 2011, arXiv:1109.0923.
[29] K. B. Petersen and M. S. Pedersen, "The matrix cookbook," Nov. 2012, version 20121115. [Online]. Available: http://www2.imm.dtu.dk/pubdb/p.php?3274
[30] I. Sanov, "On the probability of large deviations of random variables," *Sel. Transl. Math. Statist. Probab.*, vol. 1, pp. 213 – 244, 1961.